



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,056	10/27/2000	Steven G. Doughty	5053-31301	6719
7590	09/28/2005		EXAMINER	
ERIC B. MEYERTONS CONLEY, ROSE & TAYON, P.C. P. O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			COLBERT, ELLA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/699,056	DOUGHTY, STEVEN G.
	Examiner Ella Colbert	Art Unit 3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2005.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/01/04, 2/01/05</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-39 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 5, 10-14, 16, 20-24, 27, and 31-39 have been amended in this communication filed 4/20/05 entered as Response to Non-Final Action.
2. The 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection has been overcome by Applicants' amendment to claims 1, 10-12, 22, 23, 33, and 36 and is hereby withdrawn.
3. The Objection to the Abstract still remains as set forth here below.
4. The claim objections for claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 36, and 38 has been overcome by Applicants' amendment and is hereby withdrawn.

***Abstract***

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract contains more than 150 words.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 1-8, 12-19, and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,710,915) McElhiney .

Claims 1, 12, and 23, McElhiney teaches, A method performed in a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system, the method comprising: reading a key definition from a database (col. 1, lines 25-49 and col. 2, lines 41-45), wherein the key definition describes a location of one or more data element values in a set of transaction-related data (col. 2, lines 32-61), wherein the key definition is defined by a user of the Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system during a configuration of the FSO computer system, wherein the configuration of the FSO computer system occurs when a software program on the FSO computer system is initially set up for processing FSO transactions (col. 4, lines 6-18 and col. 5, lines 10-

29); reading from the transaction-related data the one or more data element values described in the key definition (col. 7, lines 14-48); and transferring the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to a processing key value (col. 7, lines 38-48). McElhiney did not expressly teach the computer system is a Financial Service Organization computer system. However, McElhiney teaches a computer system that can be used as a Financial Service Organization computer system. A Financial Service Organization computer system is considered a design choice because any computer system that can process financial information can perform the same tasks or processes as a Financial Service Organization computer system.

Claims 2, 13, and 24, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 1, further comprising: comparing the processing key value to one or more key values in the database (col. 4, lines 47-col. 5, line 9); and reading a processing parameter value from the database in response to finding a match between the processing key value and one of the one or more key values stored in the database (col. 5, lines 40-64); wherein the processing parameter value read from the database is configured for use in processing the transaction-related data in the FSO computer system (col. 4, lines 43-63).

Claims 3, 14, and 25, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 2, wherein the one or more key values in the database are defined by the user of the FSO computer system during the configuration of the FSO computer system, wherein the configuration of the FSO computer system occurs when a software program on the FSO computer system is initially set up for processing FSO transactions (col. 5, lines 1-17).

Claims 4, 15, and 26, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 2, wherein the database further comprises a plurality of processing parameter tables, wherein each processing parameter table comprises one or more rows, wherein each row in the processing parameter table comprises one processing parameter value and one key value (col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 43).

Claims 5, 16, and 27, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 4, wherein the key definition is one of a plurality of key definitions in the database, wherein each of the plurality of key definitions in the database is associated with one of the plurality of processing parameter tables in the database, wherein the plurality of key definitions associated with one of the plurality of tables is stored in a key definition table, wherein reading the key definition from the database comprises reading the key definition for the processing parameter table from the key definition table, wherein the key definition further describes a data format of the key values in the one or more rows of the processing parameter table to which the key definition is associated (col. 5, lines 42-64).

Claims 6, 17, and 28, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 5, wherein each of the key values in the processing parameter table comprises one or more key element values (col. 5, lines 30-41).

Claims 7, 18, and 29, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 6, wherein each of the plurality of key definitions in the database comprises one or more key elements, wherein each of the one or more key elements describes a data format of one of the one or more key element values in the key values (col. 6, lines 30-51).

Claims 8, 19, and 30, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 1, wherein the key definition comprises one or more key elements, wherein each of the one or more key elements describes a location and data format of one of the one or more data element values in the transaction-related data (col. 2, lines 32-40 and lines 46-61). This dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claim 1.

8. Claims 9-11, 20-22, 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,710,915) McElhiney in view of (US 5,864,679) Kanai et al, hereafter Kanai.

Claims 9, 20, and 31, McElhiney failed to teach, The method of claim 1, further comprising: reading a search mask from the database, wherein the search mask comprises one or more search mask fields, wherein each of the one or more search mask fields corresponds to one of the one or more data element values described in the key definition, and wherein each of the one or more search mask fields comprises a search mask field value. Kanai teaches, reading a search mask from the database, wherein the search mask comprises one or more search mask fields, wherein each of the one or more search mask fields corresponds to one of the one or more data element values described in the key definition, and wherein each of the one or more search mask fields comprises a search mask field value (col. 48, line 31-col. 49, line 15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to read a search mask from the database, wherein the search mask comprises one or more search mask fields, wherein each of the one or more search

mask fields corresponds to one of the one or more data element values described in the key definition, and wherein each of the one or more search mask fields comprises a search mask field value. Kanai teaches, reading a search mask from the database, wherein the search mask comprises one or more search mask fields, wherein each of the one or more search mask fields corresponds to one of the one or more data element values described in the key definition, and wherein each of the one or more search mask fields comprises a search mask field value and to combine McElhiney's search table and key values with Kanai's reading a search mask from the database comprising one or more search mask fields corresponding to one or more data element values described in the key definition and wherein each of the one or more search mask fields comprises a search mask field value because such a combination would considerably improve the performance of the database thus saving time when searching and reading from a database.

Claims 10, 21, and 32, McElhiney failed to teach, The method of claim 9, wherein the transferring the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprises: transferring one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring a low collating value to the processing key value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low collating value is to be written to the processing key value. Kanai teaches, wherein the transferring the one or more data element values read from

the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprises: transferring one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring a low collating value to the processing key value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low collating value is to be written to the processing key value. Kanai teaches, wherein the transferring the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprises: transferring one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring a low collating value to the processing key value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low collating value is to be written to the processing key value (col. 31, lines 5-62 and col. 39, line 55-col. 40, line 11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transfer the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprising: transferring one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring a low collating value to the processing key value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low

collating value is to be written to the processing key value and combine McElhiney's reading a key definition from a database and key values with Kanai's transferring the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprises: transferring to the processing key value one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring to the processing key value a low collating value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low collating value is to be written to the processing key value would allow McElhiney and Kanai to have a transaction processing system configuration with reading access and the ability to search a field value that is conventionally arranged.

Claims 11, 22, and 33, McElhiney failed to teach, The method of claim 9, wherein the search mask fields or the search mask field values are defined by the user of the FSO computer system during the configuration of the FSO computer system. Kanai teaches, wherein the search mask fields or the search mask field values are defined by the user of the FSO computer system during the configuration of the FSO computer system (col. 39, line 55-col. 40, line 11 and col. 32-54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the search mask fields or the search mask field values defined by the user of the FSO computer system during the configuration of the FSO computer system and to combine McElhiney's computer system and searching with Kanai's search mask defined by a computer system during configuration because such a combination would allow

McElhiney and Kanai's systems to have a system for processing and searching transaction data in a configured computer system.

Claims 34, 36, and 38 are rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claims 1-33.

Claims 35, 37, and 39 are rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claims 3, 14, and 25.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 05/12/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Issue no. 1: Applicants' argue: McElhiney does not appear to teach or suggest a user of an FSO computer system defining a key definition that describes a location of data element values in a set of transaction-related data during configuration of the FSO computer system, the configuration occurring when a software program on the FSO computer system is initially set up for processing FSO transactions has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: Applicants' appear to be arguing their amendments to claim 1. It is interpreted that McElhiney teaches a user of an FSO computer system defining a key definition that describes a location of data element values in a set of transaction-related data during configuration of the FSO computer system, the configuration occurring when a software program on the FSO computer system is initially set up for processing FSO transactions in col. 2, lines 32-61. An FSO computer can be any computer that is capable of performing the functions of

transactions for a financial organization. McElhiney teach such a computer in col. 4, line 8 (computer system 100) capable of performing transactions in lines 51-65.

Issue no. 2: Applicants' argue: The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least the features as amended in claim 5, in combination with the other features of the claim has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: Applicants' appear to be arguing their claim amendment to claim 5.

Issue no. 3: Applicants' argue: Kanai does not appear to teach or suggest reading a search mask from a database, wherein the search mask comprises search mask fields corresponding to one of the data element values described in the key definition, in combination with the other features of claim 9 has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: It is interpreted that Kanai teaches reading a search mask from a database, wherein the search mask comprises search mask fields corresponding to one of the data element values described in the key definition in col. 48, line 31-col. 49, line 15 or at least what is considered to be the claim limitations of claim 9.

Issue no. 4: Applicants' argue: Kanai does not appear to teach or suggest transferring a data element value read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring a low collating value to the processing key value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low collating value is to be written to the processing key value, in combination with other features of claim 10 has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: It is interpreted that Kanai teaches the claim limitations of claim in col. 31,

lines 5-62 and col. 39, line 55-col. 40, line 11 or at least what is interpreted to be "processing a key value into a low collating value" in col. 31, lines 35-42) and in combination with the other claim features.

Conclusion: In this rejection of claim 1 and others, for example under Section 103 (a) of Title 35 of the United States Code, the Examiner carefully drew up a correspondence between the Applicants' claimed limitations and one or more referenced passages in the McElhiney and Kanai references, what is well known in the art, and what is known to one having ordinary skill in the art (the skilled artisan). The Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the Specification (see below):

2111        Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation [R-1]

>CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).*<

Applicant is respectfully requested to point out to the examiner and in the independent claims the inventive concept of the invention and to distinctly and clearly claim that inventive concept in the claim language.

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**Inquiries**

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 571-272-6741. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 6:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 571-272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.  
For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



E. Colbert

**Primary Patent Examiner**

September 20, 2005